



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,177	04/06/2001	Alejandro H. Abdelnur	80168-0121	4373
32658	7590	04/16/2007	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEEN ST. DENVER, CO 80202			KESACK, DANIEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/827,177	ABDELNUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dan Kesack	3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,5,8-11,13 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 16-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 26, 2007 has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 16-18 are currently pending. The rejections are as stated below.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and use the invention, i.e., failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The test to be applied under the written description portion of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of later claimed subject matter. Vas-Cat, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F. 2d 1555, 1565, 19 USPQ2d 111, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 1991), reh'rg denied (Fed. Cir. July 8, 1991) and reh'rg, en banc, denied (Fed. Cir. July 29, 1991).

The applicants have failed to provide an enabling disclosure in the detailed description of the embodiment. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to support the subject matter set forth in these claims.

While Application teaches the current invention calculates a "distance" between the polarity of normalized dimensions of the active order and the set of normalized dimensions for the passive orders (page 11 lined 11-15), this disclosure is not enabling for one to identify what the "polarity" of a normalized dimension is, or how it is used to calculate a "distance" between the orders.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luke et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,131,087, in view of Shepherd, U.S. Patent No. 6,912,510, and further in view of Macready, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0016759.

Claim 1, Luke discloses a method for automatically identifying, matching, and near-matching buyers and sellers in electronic market transactions. Luke teaches solicitations for goods and services being received, said solicitations containing dimensions, including a product identifier, price, payment date, delivery destination (column 5 lines 62-67), said dimensions expressed in numeric terms on a linear scale by converting the dimensions from every solicitation to a standard format (column 6 lines 1-11), determining the existence of a matching order among a plurality of stored orders (abstract, and figure 2 step 200), and matching offer and solicitation data from market participants and notifying originators of the matching data of the results of any such matching operations (column 6 lines 16-19).

Claim 3, Luke teaches receiving an active order, including a name value pair and characteristics (column 6 lines 45-60), determining the existence of a matching order among a plurality of stored passive orders which include an identical name value pair to that of the active order (column 7 lines 14-16), and includes normalized dimensions based on characteristics that match normalized dimensions corresponding to the received characteristics (column 5 line 60 – column 6 line 11). Luke further teaches

matching offer and solicitation data based on submitted dimensions, and using submitted parameters to automatically evaluate the final offer and reach a decision, which inherently could be a rejection, even though the dimensions match. Examiner interprets this feature to encompass the claimed "applying a rule based filter to determine whether the passive order matches the active order, and rejecting matches which do not pass this criteria" (column 9 lines 13-26, column 9 line 57 – column 10 line 14).

Claims 1, 3, Luke fails to teach the dimensions being normalized by converting to a value between zero and one.

Macready teaches a system and method for identifying trades between parties by variables which define characteristics of offers, and normalizing said variables using a normalizing function, resulting in offer criteria within the range of [0, 1] (paragraph 60). This normalized criteria is then used to identify trades between parties. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the normalizing step of Luke to include converting all characteristics to a value between zero and one, because Macready teaches the feature requires the average distance of any negotiation variable from its ideal value is the same for all dimensions, and further because, "it is important to normalize the contributions of each variable so that the buyer can weight the importance of various contributions to utility (paragraph 24).

Claims 1, 3, Luke further fails to explicitly teach applying a rule based filter to determine a match after orders have been matched based on matching normalized dimensions.

Shepherd teaches a system and method for exchanging risk management contracts, wherein orders for said contracts are matched within a database for having matching parameters (column 4 lines 17-39), and wherein thereafter a number of rules are checked for compliance, and wherein an order which may match in parameters may be rejected thereafter for failing compliance rules (column 20 lines 35-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Luke to include the rule-based filtering, as described by Shepherd because Luke teaches submitting a matched order to an order participant, wherein the participant may then evaluate the order and make a final decision, Luke further teaches the evaluation can be fully automated based on parameters chosen by the participant (column 9 line 57 – column 10 line 4).

Claim 5, Luke teaches the characteristics including one or more of price, quality, quantity, and time (column 6 lines 36-44).

Claim 8, Luke teaches determining the existence of a matching order among a plurality of stored orders (abstract, and figure 2 step 200).

Claims 9, 10, Luke teaches comparing the normalized dimensions of standing and current solicitation data in order to determine if an intersection occurs, intersections occurring as perfect matches, or near-matches, wherein the "polarity" is interpreted to mean the upper and lower limits of the offer, and the distance calculation is embodied by the tests conducted by formulas (column 7-8, 205.1-207.4 and figures 2C, 2D).

Claim 11, Luke teaches searching for a match using the "preferred" data point of a dimension of a solicitation, and increasing the range of the solicited dimension by expanding the search to include lower and upper limits, if no match is found (figure 2A).

Claim 13, Luke teaches the offer data including data identifying the homogenous good or service and data relating to the value of the homogenous good or service (column 6 lines 36-44).

Claim 16, Luke teaches notifying an entity associated with an order if a match is made (column 6 lines 16-19).

9. Claims 17 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luke, Shepherd and Macready, as applied above, and further in view of Walker et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,418,415.

Luke fails to teach aggregating a set of orders, and disaggregating and resubmitting a remainder offer after a match has been completed.

Walker discloses a system and method for aggregating multiple buyers, in an offer matching system, in which a buyer's conditional purchase offer (CPO) is grouped into an aggregate CPO, which then may be offered as a single solicitation. If a buyer's CPO is accepted, the status of the individual CPO is changed to "completed" and the aggregate CPO is changed to reflect the aggregate CPO containing only the remaining solicitations (column 3 lines 38-49). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Luke to include the teachings of Walker because the aggregation of buyers provides benefits to buyers by creating buying power associated with volume purchasing, and benefits sellers by increasing business and lowering per-transaction costs.

Response to Arguments

10. In remarks filed January 26, 2007, Applicant states, "Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, and 16-18 were presenting in the pending request for continued examination." The listing of claims includes claim 13 as well. Examiner has addressed claim 13 in the above rejection, but respectfully points out this inconsistency for the benefit of future communications.

11. Applicant has also requested confirmation that the Macready provisional supports the material cited in the published application. The provisional application of

Macready has been reviewed, and Examiner confirms that the cited portions of the Macready reference are fully supported therein.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Kesack whose telephone number is 571-272-5882. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER